

NWP
979.51
M381

8P

B

ur Right t
h Great E

E HOUSE
to, the H
ale, the R
tee on F
d Convent
ag under c

MARTIN,
attee near

ust confess
experience
however
er felt before
rely divest
with greater
committee th
it subject.

enter into
on of our (

the able
Mr. JONES

maintained

gainst Gre

Our title

Mr. CALHO

ax, and by

man from

ew of whi

like myself

y argumen

member on

my colleag

At the con

leman from

d regret at b

of his birt

er from M

me, [pointin

old, in Sou

my birth ;

the, Moultr

and of sta

ed a halo

Sir, well r

is the no

SPEECH

OF

BARKLEY MARTIN,

OF TENNESSEE,

Our Right to Oregon, and the Resolution of Notice to terminate the Joint Convention of 1819 with Great Britain. Delivered in Committee of the Whole, February, 1846.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, February 16, the House being in Committee of the Whole, the Resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to terminate the Convention of 1819 with Great Britain, are under consideration:

MARTIN, of Tennessee, addressed the Committee nearly as follows:

I must confess that I am not wholly destitute of experience in public speaking. I expect, however, on this occasion, a diffidence never felt before. I should be gratified, could I only divest myself of it, that I might be with greater clearness, to communicate to the Committee the views I entertain on this important subject. In the outset, I will promise not to enter into a prolonged discussion on the question of our (the American) title to Oregon, as the able and learned member from Georgia [Mr. JONES] has clearly and most convincingly maintained the validity of our title, not against Great Britain, but against all the world.

Our title has been most ably set forth by Mr. CALHOUN, as well as by Mr. BURR, and by the honorable and venerable member from Massachusetts, [Mr. ADAMS.] Few of which, it would be presumption in me to attempt to elucidate, by a long argument, that which is so apparent to every member on this floor, with only two exceptions—my colleagues, [Messrs. GENTRY and EWER.] At the commencement of this Congress, a gentleman from Michigan; [Mr. CHIPMAN] expressed regret at being a native of the State (Verily of his birth. In that I differ from the member from Michigan, and with the member from South Carolina, and I glory in the land of my birth; the land of heroes; the land of the Moultrie, and of Marion; the land of the brave and of statesmen, whose brilliant careers shed a halo of glory over her own institutions. Sir, well may I glory in my birth place; it is the noblest reflection in "memory's

Loving the land of my birth, it is reasonable to suppose that I should naturally feel an admiration for her statesmen and sons who held their seats upon this floor during the 23rd Congress. That I should be led as a backwoodsman (as I was denominated by the Editor of the *Washington Union*, which I appreciate as a compliment,) to be influenced in the formation of my opinions upon this great National subject, by the action of those distinguished for their sound judgment, learning, and patriotic devotion to the honored institutions of our common country, is natural. When I learned that the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. RHETT] or either of his colleagues, was to occupy the floor on such and such days, I felt sure that my time-honored native State would be ably represented. When I saw my colleague [Mr. MILTON BROWN] voting for the amendment to give Great Britain notice to terminate the Convention of 1827, and then voting against the bill as amended, I asked, Was it right?—When I saw my able predecessor [Mr. A. V. BROWN] voting for the bill as amended; when I read the names of the gentlemen from South Carolina, [Messrs. BURT and RHETT] and a host of others, voting for the Bill that passed the house in 1845, and for the annexation of the Lone Star, I came immediately to the conclusion that Oregon was ours; that we should extend our law over our own soil, and give to Great Britain the peaceful notice provided for by the Convention of 1827. After mature reflection, and when before the people canvassing for the seat I now occupy, I took the bold ground contemplated by the Resolution now before this committee. Such were my views; such are still my views—and the determination has been strengthened. Other means having failed, it becomes us to march up to this question, directing the President to act in the name, and by authority, of this Government, and terminate the said Convention of 1827.

I prefer sir, and will vote for the Resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment. If that cannot pass, then

I will vote for either of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. DROMGOOLE] or South Carolina, [Mr. BLACK.] And last, not least—I beg pardon; and last, yet least, I may give my vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. HILLIARD] notwithstanding the tendency of his resolution to increase the much complained of “one man’s power.”

The honorable gentleman from Alabama, in the debate on this question, told us that he had separated from his political friends, with whom he was in the habit of acting, when he broke a way from the bulk of that party on the Texas question; but that, on the question now under debate, he found a majority of his party with him; as well as a large portion of the Democratic party.

A large portion of the Democratic party with him! not, sir, with him for his amendment in preference to either of the others as above noted! Not a majority of the Democratic party for that non-committal Resolution which is designed to shift the responsibility from this house, and give to the President the power as argued by my colleague [Mr. COCK] to annul, repeal, or terminate the treaty of 1827, which treaty was and now is, the supreme law of the land! Entertaining a high regard for the gentleman, (once my near neighbor in Georgia) I would ask the gentleman if he did not, in 1840, and in 1844, oppose strenuously the “one man power”—the “veto” power—as provided for in the Constitution? I do not see the nod of assent—but I see the playful smile, signifying yea. We all recollect the hue and cry against the increase and extension of alleged encroachments upon the legislative powers, conferred by the people, by this “one man power”—it was the subject of many able and eloquent appeals to influence the American people to confer their suffrages upon one who had openly avowed that the “veto power” should be qualified, and that it should be exercised only in extreme cases. Yet, strange to tell, in this very hall, before the eloquence of able gentlemen, now members of the 29th Congress, has died away upon the ear of listening multitudes, one of that party comes forward, and, by Resolution, tenders to the President the discretion to annul absolutely a supreme law of this land.

Permit me, sir, to warn my friends, and tell them that this measure is avowed by one gentleman in the opposition, with frankness. If of good result, well; if evil follow, we will hold (the President) responsible before the American people. It may be the policy of the gentleman from Alabama, and the avowed policy of the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. DELANO] by him so expressed, as to avoid responsibility; but it is not so with the Representative from the 6th Congressional District of Tennessee. In this result, great as it necessarily will be, the member now addressing the Chair feels, as he trusts every

American should feel, a laudable ambition to share in its momentous consequences.

My colleague [Mr. COCK] who has much credit from this body, learned as (at least it should be) in his maiden speech, that this notice is a war measure. In substance, he calls to his aid the language of our venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ADAMS] used at the last session of the Congress, who expressly declared that the notice was a “war measure”;—and that, “because of that character, and the war power expressly given to Congress by the Constitution, the House had every thing to do with it, my colleague then vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, when he in the language of Mr. ADAMS, that it is a “war measure”—and “that Congress and not the President was the war making power”? My colleague again said, “it is proper to give to Congress certain notice of our determination to abrogate the Convention of 1827.” Our determination to abrogate! How, give this notice, by giving the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama? Surely not. Would my colleague give the President additional power? Such is the fact—A power to declare war, if the amendment is adopted—Is this in character and creed of the party to define and restrict the war power? The conclusion is the reverse.

My policy is, or Congress, in language and unequivocal, to speak to England the Chief Magistrate of this nation; speak to her provided for by the Convention, and tell her the “joint occupancy,” so familiarly used, and must terminate. It is a peace measure, so considered; it is so intended; and is supported by able gentlemen on this floor, who give the notice. Give, then, this notice, an expiration of twelve months, we are assured by the treaty of Ghent, the rightful power of the territory, surrendered and conveyed by the British Government through a qualified agent at that time.

This notice should be given, that the American soil should terminate—and that the citizens be more perfectly secured and in their rights of freemen to American soil. This notice, that the way may be cleared into full force and effect what is contemplated an organic territorial Government. Great Britain notice, that England may understand, that we are resolved to protect our citizens to occupy our soil, and to defend both the energies of this growing young Republic.

By doing this, sir, we encourage and we strengthen the people’s love of freedom. Throw around your citizens the protection of your stripes and stars!—let them that they are under your laws!—that they are not neglected, cast off, and you will have defenders, which will be a defence against the der, who dare claim, dare seek to get a

American soil. Maintain our rights, protect our citizens wherever they are, and you will have the noblest patriotism—and the people will rally to arms, to the tented field, and to the field, against the savage foe, against this title, less, savage, civilized Government, once whetted the knife, and gave the tomahawk to the Indians, that was reddened in the blood of our innocent and helpless ones. Maintain our rights; our citizens protect; be just to all, and march forward and give the President the power contemplated by the Resolution, and the people will soon erect temples of justice; in which to worship the living God, and in the hearing of the waves of the deep Pacific.

I have been particular in defining my position upon this great American question, which seems to be so closely allied with the growth and perpetuity of our glorious institutions, that I who have honored me with their confidence understand me thoroughly. I shall now propose to notice the remarks which fell from several gentlemen during the discussion of this all-abiding subject, and generally to defend our country against the *jeers* and *jibes* thrown upon a nation by those who call themselves the representatives of freemen, and who were so peculiar in depicting the strength of Great Britain, and heralding forth to the world the impotence of this brave, gallant, and free people, who have met England man to man, and gun to gun, whose prowess is the theme of admiration throughout the civilized world.

In doing this, I will respectfully notice what was said from the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ADAMS] and also from a gentleman from Indiana [Mr. C. B. SMITH]. What the gentleman from Massachusetts said, I will repeat, and my word for it, I believe there will be no war, unless President Polk backs out."

Mr. ADAMS.—The gentleman misunderstood me. The CHAIR.—Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield the floor to the gentleman from Massachusetts, for an explanation?

Mr. MARTIN.—Certainly.

Mr. ADAMS.—I will explain. I said I believed there would be no war; and that I rather believed, in case of necessity, that war would be prevented by the President's backing out. I said that I apprehended that if the country pushed its rights, I thought it ought to do, and hoped it would, Great Britain would yield; but if she did not, that war could be prevented by Mr. Polk's backing out.

Mr. MARTIN.—I find I did not much misunderstand the gentleman. The spirit of his remark was caught up by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. C. B. SMITH,] who endorsed the sentiment. I would speak of the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, with the profoundest respect and veneration. Very respectfully, therefore, would I say that he is under a mistake as

to the character of the President. I know his iron nerve: I know his noble bearing: his firm and determined purpose—cool, cautious, yet decided—and I feel implicit confidence that if Congress will but clothe him with the power to give this notice, he will do it, and not recede a single inch. The member from Ohio, [Mr. GIDDINGS] that young and magnanimous State, in the withering blast of his heated imagination, is at a loss for words sufficiently contemptuous to describe the President's pusillanimity. He says "you cannot kick the President into a war." Let me ask whence has this light so suddenly dawned on the member's intellect? Where did he get that intelligence?

Mr. GIDDINGS here rose and inquired whether Mr. M. wished a reply.

Mr. MARTIN.—Take your seat, sir, and keep your seat, sir!

The CHAIR.—The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. MARTIN.—I ask again, whence such wisdom? Whence such a sudden revelation? Permit me to remark that he too has misunderstood the character of the Chief Magistrate of his country, as well as the character of the southern people. I will tell the member one truth. When his black regiments—his odoriferous allies—the contemplation of which seems to give him so much delight, shall reach the south, the President, with the aid of all true patriots, "before we drink the dregs to be pressed to our lips," will kick not only him, but his co-adjutors, out of South Carolina, and hold up to the scorn and condemnation. [Here Mr. M. was called to order by the Chair.]

I will now (said Mr. M.) pay my respects to my honorable colleague, [Mr. COCKE,] for whom personally I cherish the highest respect. He seems, by some means, to have worked himself into a pet, and because he is a pet himself, he imagines, as a matter of course, that every member of the cabinet is also in a pet, and the President more particularly. My colleague says that, after publishing to all the world that our title to Oregon is clear and indisputable, the President immediately turns round and offers to give away one-half it; and then, because the British minister does not accept the offer, he flies into a pet, and withdraws it. Another of my colleagues [Mr. GENTRY,] says the President "huffishly" withdraws it. "Huffishly!" I appeal to the noble Tennessee spirit which I know inhabits the breasts of my colleagues, and I ask of them to say what the President could have done less? When Mr. Pakenham said to him, England expects a proposition on your part, which shall have greater justice and liberality, would he have had the Chief Magistrate of this great Republic to have degraded himself and the American people by repeating the offer, and humbly soliciting its acceptance? Would he have asked him to implore Queen Victoria graciously to vouchsafe one smile of approbation

upon it? I scorn such an imputation on our Government as implied in the sneer. I for one would have denounced Mr. Polk if he had not withdrawn the offer the instant it was so discourteously rejected.

Is Oregon ours? I hear another sound coming from an honorable gentleman from New York, [Mr. CULVER,] who says that Oregon is ours, and that "there would have been none of this difficulty if the President had not swaggered so much in his Inaugural." I would respectfully ask of the gentleman wherein the "swaggering" consists? Is it in the declaration that our title to our property is clear and indisputable? Was this "swaggering?"—was this "arrogant boasting?" What, sir! has it come to this, that a Government that represents twenty millions of freemen is not to proclaim to the world that they hold their title to the soil of their country clear and indisputable, under the penalty of being stigmatised as a swaggerer and boaster?

My colleague [Mr. COCKE] says that the President proposed to give away a part of the territory thus indisputably ours. I put it to my colleague of the Nashville district, [Mr. EWING,] who says that he had no right to do this, and to my colleague from the Williamson district, [Mr. GENTRY,] who coincides in the remark, was it a fault in the President to do what is right—to offer what my colleague from the Williamson district is himself in favor of—the line of 49°? How magnanimous! how consistent! to condemn another for pursuing a policy, which we adopt and approve of for ourselves!

But I am told again that the President proposed to give away a part of our territory. I ask did he not most satisfactorily explain the reasons and considerations which induced him to make the proposition? With the highly laudable and patriotic desire of settling amicably and honorably the long pending question between the two countries, he had repeated the offer previously made by President Monroe and President Adams, and sanctioned by the approval of many of our ablest and wisest statesmen. It was made in a proper spirit of deference and respect to the opinions and acts of his predecessors in office. Had the case been entirely new, the proposition would never have been made by President Polk.

On the question of our title to Oregon, I regret to hear, for the first time in my brief career, an assertion on the floor of Congress, that the American Government has less title to the territory than had even been conceded by the British Government itself. That government admits that we have rights in Oregon, and a clear title to a part of that territory; and who is it that, in the face of this admission by the British government, rises in this hall, and declares to her, and to the world, "No, no; our title is doubtful—our right is doubtful." I regret to say it is one of my colleagues, [Mr. EWING] a gentleman who, of

all others, I should have thought had drawn the deepest of the spirit of the Hero of the Republic. Yet he tells us our rights in Oregon are doubtful—the American title is doubtful—this in the face of the admission of the British government itself, of the validity of our title to a portion of the territory. An honorable gentleman greatly risked his reputation as a lawyer and a statesman, in the hazarding of an opinion; but I beg that the committee will judge of the gentleman's legal and professional standing at home, by the opinion so rashly uttered here. I can assure gentlemen that as a lawyer he stands pre-eminent in his district; but I think that while he is so good a lawyer, he is so poor a politician. [A laugh.]

My colleague from the Williamson district, [Mr. GENTRY,] goes even farther. He says we have no title—nor have the British any title to Oregon—nor any rights there, and he went on to say that the Emperor of the Celestial Empire

Mr. C. J. INGERSOLL.—The Celestial Empire, then—

Mr. MARTIN.—Well, the Emperor of the Celestial Empire, then—

Mr. C. J. INGERSOLL.—The brother says, my Sun and Moon.

Mr. MARTIN.—Very well; be it so. The gentleman ought to be learned in these matters, him who is Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. [Laughter.] My colleague, then, says that if this potentate, the brother of the Sun, Moon, were to "locate" himself in Oregon, on a spot occupied neither by Great Britain nor America, he would, in process of time, get a title quite as good as that of Great Britain or the United States. We have no title there, nor rights of any kind, but he admits that the British have claims. He says that he is a farmer, and goes for a "straddle fence" on the parallel of 49° north. I am also a farmer, and a very good one. I was not aware, however, that Tennessee farmers were in the habit of running their fences, whether straight or crooked, on their neighbor's land, or on land where they had no right or title. I wish to inquire of the gentleman when this became a law or usage of Tennessee. It is with me a subject of deep regret, that the British government, and the world, should be told by a representative on the floor of Congress of brave and patriotic Tennesseans, that we have no right or title to Oregon—only a claim—when right and title have been constantly asserted, when there have been a subject of the deepest solicitude to the part of our government, since the administration of Jefferson.

I will now call the attention of the committee to some of the remarks of the honorable gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. PENDLETON] often designated as the "lone star" (of whiggery) from that ancient commonwealth. I mean the gentleman of the delicate allusions—and who heard the beat of the British drum all round the globe. The gentleman, I perceive, is not in his senses. I would that he were, so that I might feel

of the American people on the floor of Congress shall reach the little Queen of England, they will effectually erase from the royal mind every sentiment of alarm excited by the patriotic speech of the war-worn veteran and statesman [General CASS] in the Senate; it will be the signal for mirth and exultation, that the American "fear;" that a representative in the American Congress proclaims her "title to Oregon doubtful;" that another representative has denied that America has any "right or title" to Oregon, but "a claim only;" and that her drums are heard in the morning "to rattle all around the world." Sir, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PENDLETON] need not be under any solicitude for the repose of the youthful Queen so rudely disturbed by the patriotic bearing and military fame of General CASS; the indications on this floor from so many gentlemen that with them "discretion is the better part of valor," will effectually allay any apprehensions she may have indulged. The gentleman has so little regard to our rights in Oregon, and to our claim to that territory, that he says he would not give the paper on which the deed could be written for the "whole of Oregon" to-morrow—and why? It is too far off; we don't want it; it is not worth a fig. Sir, was this the language of our Revolutionary sires when they resolved to resist the power of Great Britain? Was it the language of the American people at the purchase of Louisiana? Did they then say, this territory is too far away—we don't want it—it is not worth a fig? He says it will take some six or eight, or ten months, to go to Oregon by sea; but I am told that we can go the whole distance of fifteen thousand miles in four months; while England has to go twenty thousand; and we can make the land journey of three thousand miles from New York in three months.

One word as to the language used by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. WINTHROP]—not the venerable ex-President. There is a material difference in the opinions of the two gentlemen. This gentleman [a laugh] said that, on the whole, it was a little doubtful as to title, but he thought that, of the two, we had the better title. But then, he asks, are we going to turn savages, and fight Great Britain for such a strip of territory? In his regular-built speech he does not say savages, but brutes. Are we going to turn brutes, and use mere brute force to support our title? This may sound well from the representative of the city, in which it was resolved that it was unbecoming a moral and religious people to rejoice at the victories achieved by our gallant tars over the boasting "mistress of the seas," and from the portion of the Union that held out blue-lights to guide the fleets of the enemy; but it does not sound very well to an American ear, and is not very palatable to an American heart. He says, if we fight for Oregon, it will be a contest of mere brute force. I ask him, if Oregon is ours, and it shall come

eventually to the last resort of sovereign power, whether he would not employ "brute force" to maintain the rights of his country? Our country has employed "brute force" in a question of a trifling tax upon a few pounds force and that, too, in Boston, the gentleman how cradle of liberty.

The Representative of the Charleston [Mr. HOLMES] acknowledges that he is here, and he asks us if we went out with a rifle as a stray sheep from the fangs of a wolf. When we reached the spot, found our way out of the jaws of the lion, whether we would be afraid too, and go back and get eight or ten flees more? I would meet the figure used by the gentleman, by saying that our object is to turn the lion from getting hold of our "sheep." The gentleman from Charleston is not without his rifle, and that South Carolina dog just what I want in this contest. It was a war, in 1776, in 1812, and why should he be afraid in 1846? The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PENDLETON] endorses the declaration, in the Representative of the Charleston district says he too is afraid. Well, sir, I ask you, who created this sudden panic? I remember once a British army invaded this District, and consumed this capitol with fire. The gentleman from Virginia was then, probably, playing on the green lawn; or, schoolboy, was "bobbing" his pinhook, in hope of catching a "minnow" in the babbling brook. He heard the booming of the distant cannon, even beheld afar off the rimy smoke that marked the barbarian triumph of the invading invader, which, nay, was probably within hearing of the British drum, the mere thought of which now strikes terror to his heart. One might imagine that the recollection of a flamethrower, and the insolent triumphs of the royal soldiers, would have enkindled the fire of indignation, and awakened an ardent desire for an opportunity of avenging ourselves, sir, the aggressor, and wiping out in his blinding memory of his atrocities and his insolence, where the ghost of former days rises but in terror and dread to the gentleman, and he frankly acknowledges that he is afraid. In making such a confession, I feel very sure he does injustice to Virginia: such cannot be her sentiment. Never!

But these over cautious gentlemen are not urgent in their efforts to infect others with fears. If we but shake our hand at Old England, we are reproached with gasconading. But I told of her power, her resources, what she can do, what she can do, and what she can do. But I beg of gentlemen, if they are willing to go for this notice, to cease unavailing and depreciating the ability and the willingness of the American people to defend themselves, and their interests, when assailed from any quarter, however powerful. Mr. CLAY, when addressed by the submissionists with some

last resort of sovereigns, not employ "brute force" of his country? Our arms and the power of Great Britain!" "Force" in a question which would apply with equal pertinence upon a few pounds force in 1846.

force in 1840.
how humiliating must it be to an American foreign land, when he reads of the glory, war, and the invincibility of the British heralded by members of an American army as an argument to deter it from asserting the National rights and honor. How, I ask, can such declarations of our inability to defend our rights, and cope with an enemy that our fathers successfully grappled with in infancy we had a distinct nationality, fall upon the ears of those veterans of the Revolution, who hold of our "sheep-skin amongst us? Will they not be reconciled, and with reason, that this is a degenerate age, when the roll of the British drums, that only directed them with hearts

2. and why should he, the enemy, be heard by their offspring, the lapse of half a century, with "fear!"

Well, sir, I ask you in the hearts of the American people there panic? I remem^{ber} burning brightly the fires of '76, we are invaded this Distracted upon—I had almost said with a sneer—with fire. The gre^{at} "war gentlemen;" we are charged with then, probably, play^{ing} gasconading?" yes, gasconading! If it be in law; or, school^{book} gasconading, let us, for the honor of our Revolu^{tion} pinhook, in hope of our sires, gasconade on the side of our own the babbling brook, red country. Truly there has been gascon^{ading} of the distant can^{on}, even to the rattling of England's morning my smoke that morn^{ing}, producing that sensation which, I trust the invading inced^{ed}, will never be felt by but one Virginian; within hearing of this felt, never again expressed in the halls of the mere thought of American Congress. I ask, can the senti^{ment} of this heart. One might of the gentleman be the sentiments of the collection of a flaming Dominion?" (Here Gen. ARCHERSON, halt triumphs of the royal, said, No, never; and God forbid it ever unkindled the fire and.)

wakened an ardent the gentleman says we must negotiate. avenging ourselves, sir, we have done it; we have been ne- pieing out in his biting for nearly thirty years, and we are now lies and his insolence where we were in 1819. But, again, we says rises but in terms we must settle this long pending ques- and, he frankly a by arbitration. And who are we to select id. In making such an arbitrator? Russia? She is a member re he does injustice the Holy Alliance. Austria? She is also a t be her sentiment. Prussia? She likewise, is a member the holy fraternity of despots. France? She

tious gentlemen ought not nominally, is also in feeling and prin-
 to infect others who with them. And why not submit the ques-
 e our hand at Old England between us and Great Britain to the arbitra-
 with gasconading. But of any of these powers? Because the endow-
 resources, what is the object of the Holy Alliance is to check the
 , and what she advances of Republican principles throughout the
 gentlemen, if they will. And the feelings of the French Govern-
 notice, to cease united towards us and Republican principles, is
 the ability and the way well indicated by her recent conduct in
 people to defend themselves, and her present wanton and unprovoked
 when assailed first, in conjunction with England, upon the
 cruel. Mr. CLAY, continue Republic. Russia has been thought
 submissionists who are some as likely to be an impartial umpire

If the Wolverines, the Hoosiers, the Suck

ers, and the Buckeyes should settle in the proximity of 54° 40', going to a man for Democratic principles, (as they used to sing "a Democratic wife or none at all") his Russian Majesty might not like such people for near neighbors, but would infinitely prefer the British. I would trust none of these monarchs for referees. But my friend from Virginia is in favor of "a masterly inactivity." I am really at some loss to know what a "masterly inactivity" is. I am told by some gentlemen it is "the American multiplication table." The gentleman said that Mr. Polk and Mr. Buchanan never calculated on success by this rule, for Victoria and Peel were ———. The gentleman ought to have recollected that he too does not seem very well to understand the rule of subtraction, for he, like myself, has not practically learned that one from two make three. (A laugh.)

My friend from the Tenth Legion [MR. BEDINGER,] says he is for a masterly inactivity: we must lie low; we must "bide our time." Wait a little, says the prudent gentleman—wait a little while—John Bull is getting to be an old man, and you will soon be strong enough to cope with him, and get him down. I really did not expect such an exhibition of Virginia chivalry. Do your bullies in Virginia wait till their adversaries get old and feeble, and then fall aboard of them.— This is a "masterly inactivity," indeed! Wait till John Bull is old and decrepid, and then you can get him on his back, and gouge him at pleasure! This is Virginia chivalry! This, then, is "masterly inactivity!"

But the gentleman explained himself. He gave us a graphic sketch of the American eagle, and held him up as an example for our imitation, in our course about Oregon. And what was this imperial bird, after all? A foolish fowl (if it was an eagle, it must have been a very young one,) that took his seat on a tall rock at Harper's Ferry, because he was afraid of a cloud that afterwards passed by without a drop of rain. [A laugh.] If this is the gentleman's "masterly inactivity," I will have none of it. The gentleman the other day said he was speaking without his glasses, and could not discern the gentleman from Ohio, on the other side of the hall. I would respectfully ask of him whether he was without his glasses when he saw that cowardly bird. [Laughter.] This Harper's Ferry eagle of his, has been sitting on that rock, with his wings folded in "masterly inactivity," for nearly thirty years:—but I would say to him: let us give this notice—let us break the fetters that have so long paralyzed every movement of this noble bird, and then, unencumbered, he can spread his majestic pinions to every breath of heaven—his flight will be upward and onward, breasting any and every storm—facing the eye of day, until his glorious form shall be lost in the dazzling empyrean.

We are told that there will be a war. Perhaps you may be able to convince us that there will be a war; but this should not deter us from asserting our rights. The gentleman says we

will get whipped in the fight, and asks—what! do you not fear? I do fear; but not the British lion—his paw has no terrors for me. I fear to refuse to speak, lest I should offer insult to the thousands of freemen who, at the ballot box, said to me, “go and give this notice to Great Britain. Oregon is ours; and if war grows out of it, we are ready for the contest.” For myself, I have no fears of the conflict. True, it has not been my lot to mingle in the strife of actual war, but I have been familiar, since childhood, with the recital of the horrors of Indian atrocities—of the terrific war-whoop: and I have also witnessed the effect of the death-dealing rifle of the West. But I do fear, if we do not give this notice, and follow it up by additional measures, England, by our tardiness, will get possession of fair and fertile Oregon. Fear! No; we were but in our infancy as a nation—when we had but three millions of people—and we caught the British lion by his shaggy beard, and made the dew-drops fall from his mane thicker than a summer shower. And are we to fear him now, when we have twenty millions, and means of offence and defence in proportion? What did we do in 1812? We repeated the rough embrace of ’76, and sent him howling to his den. And now, for one, I say, if he will fight us again, sooner than surrender the prey he has got his claws upon, let the contest come.

But it has been said here that Kentucky and Tennessee are far in the interior, and that even the sound of the battle will not reach us. True, our States are not on the frontier; but I ask, if in the hour of peril and conflict, their hardy sons have not been found, wherever danger pressed their country’s arms? Were they not at New Orleans? and upon what battle field on our Northern frontier do not their bones whiten in the sun? They were ever ready for the warlike strife, and never more so than at the present moment, should their country demand their services. Fear! No, before they would submit to that haughty and domineering power, which seeks to bow the entire globe to her sceptre, they will cheerfully hazard all the dangers of the fight. But we are told we have no navy—no army—no cannon—no muskets—no munitions—no generals. We have generals in Tennessee; and if we had none, by the grace of God, we would raise Gen. Jackson’s “cocked hat upon a hickory pole,” with the epaulettes he wore at New Orleans, and its effect would be more magical than the standard of the Prophet of Mecca. Fifty thousand brave Tennesseans would rally at the sight, and arm themselves for the battle. I am very sure the gallant gentleman from Alabama, [Gen. McCONNELL] and the valiant gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. SIMS] would soon be upon the muster ground struggling for the pole, (much laughter.)

I had much more to say, but I perceive my time is rapidly running out. There is one thing in which I rejoice: I have seen throughout this entire debate that there is a fixed determination on all sides of the Committee, not to make this

a party question. It is truly a national I cannot, and I will not, consent that it made a party question. It is strictly phatically a National question, involving rights, the interest, and the honor of the True, I have heard this stoutly denied has been gravely asked, how is our honorated? where have the British ever insflag? But are gentlemen not aware that tion may be insulted without having its fled upon? I would say there is a que which our honor as a nation was compr and it is a burning, “murky” shame, Government has rested tamely so long I allude to the burning of the Caroline an American vessel was seized on American set on fire, cast off into the stream, and pted over the Falls of Niagara, with American enfolded in the flames of the doomsel. This was a case in which the N honor was deeply involved, and which has been atoned for. Did time permit, I could to other instances.

I am thoroughly convinced that the time soon arrive when a contest between us and British Government will become inevitable has long beheld, with jaundiced eyes, the strides of our glorious Republic to strength greatness. We are her rival in the cont dominion on the ocean; we are her rival i civilization and letters; and more than all the representative and champion of free gment, while she is the ally of the worn opotisms of the old world. She never will until she makes a mighty effort to prostrate Republic, and arrest its onward march to ness. The mighty contest between liberty despotism must soon be fought, and knowing I am for preparing our country for the co

It is said we have no arms. But the o returns show that there are more than 60 in the country, and in Tennessee every boy his own rifle by the time he is sixteen. but we have no cannon. But a gentleman Pennsylvania [Mr. THOMPSON] has told us in two years, that State alone could cast ene to supply the wants of the entire world. have men in abundance, and (pointing to galleries)—God bless them—we have the la with us. With our brave men, our noble he ed women, and God upon our side, I am sure shall triumph.

This is not the time for us to show any the like fear of Old England. I confess, for that if we are to have a fight, she is the v power, above all others, with which I would a contest. We have been told that we are bl of her blood, that we have a common ances common laws, and common language. But t is a powerless argument. No enemies are bitter as estranged friends. The union betw the two countries was severed by the tyrann oppressions of our unnatural parent; it is s dered forever; and I think of her now only w hatred for all the wrongs she has done my count

truly a national
consent that it
It is strictly
question, involv
the honor of the
s stoutly denied
how is our hono
British ever ins
men not aware the
hout having its fl
ny there is a que
ation was compr
urky" shame, a
tamey so long u
of the Caroline
seized on Americ
the stream, and p
gara, with Americ
ames of the doom
in which the N
red, and which ha
me permit, I coul

inceed that the tim
est between us a
become inevitable
undiced eyes, the
epublic to streng
rival in the conte
we are her rival i
and more than all
hampion of free g
lly of the worn o
l. She never will
y effort to prostrate
onward march to
est between liberty
ught, and knowing
untry for the co
arms. But the o
re more than 60
ennessee every boy
he is sixteen.
But a gentleman
erson] has told us
one could cast ene
ne entire world.
and (pointing to
n—we have the la
men, our noble h
our side, I am sure
ns to show any th
I confess, for
ght, she is the v
n which I would h
told that we are bl
a common ancest
language. But t
No enemies are
The union betwe
ed by the tyranni
parent; it is s
of her now only w
has done my count